

Chapter 5

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQ regulations implementing NEPA require that federal agencies provide meaningful opportunities for the public and stakeholders to provide input and identify their concerns with regard to the EIS process. Federal laws, such as the ESA, CWA, and the NHPA, mandate public involvement and consultation with agencies or federally recognized tribal governments.

This chapter documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing the SVPP Draft EIS. A complete list of agencies and individuals who received the Draft EIS can be found in the Administrative Record.

5.1.1 Public Involvement

The BLM has taken a variety of steps to inform the public, special interest groups, and local, state, and federal agencies about the proposed action alternatives for the SVPP, and to solicit feedback from these interested parties to help shape the scope and alternatives of this project. The following sections summarize the efforts taken to consult and coordinate with all interested persons, agencies, Tribes, and organizations.

5.1.1.1 Public Scoping Meetings

As part of the NEPA requirements, a notice of intent to prepare the EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on April 2, 2008. Publication of the notice of intent initiated a 60-day formal public and agency scoping period, during which the BLM solicited comments regarding the project and regarding its potential impacts.

Early in the scoping period, the BLM advertised the initiation of the EIS process through the BLM website, advertisements in the local newspapers, media releases, and direct mailings to past project stakeholders, project area stakeholders, and special-interest groups (environmental, elected officials, business interests, recreational, and tribal). Additionally, public meeting information was posted at various community outlets, such as community centers, libraries, city offices, and recreational outlets, in Goodyear and Mobile. Public briefings were held with a variety of interest groups, agencies, etc., to inform them about the project. Table 5-1 includes a list of meetings that took place, the topics discussed, and meeting attendees.

The BLM held public and agency scoping meetings for the EIS in Goodyear, Arizona, on May 28, 2008, and public scoping meetings in Maricopa and Mobile, Arizona, on May 29, 2008. At each meeting, BLM and City of Goodyear staff members were on hand to provide information on project planning activities to date and to answer questions. Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide comments on the issues and alternatives to be analyzed in the EIS.

Table 5-1. List of Meetings, Meeting Topics, and Meeting Attendees

Date	Agency/Group	Discussion/Topic	BLM Attendees
February 27, 2009	City of Goodyear, V3 Companies	Kick-off meeting	Kathleen Depukat, Emily Garber, Cheryl Blanchard, Jack Ragsdale, Jim Andersen
March 10, 2009	City of Goodyear, BrightSource Energy	Project overview	Kathleen Depukat
April 21, 2009	AGFD	Project introduction and invitation to cooperate	Kathleen Depukat, Lori Young
May 7, 2009	AGFD	Site visit	Kathleen Depukat, Cheryl Blanchard, Lori Young
May 15, 2009	City of Goodyear, AGFD, ConTech, V3 Companies	Wildlife corridors/crossings	Kathleen Depukat, Lori Young
September 8, 2009	AGFD	Wildlife corridors/crossings	Kathleen Depukat, Tim Hughes
October 7, 2009	MAG, ADOT	Hassayampa Freeway/SR 303L	Kathleen Depukat
April 6, 2010	City of Goodyear	Project schedule	Kathleen Depukat, Emily Garber
November 18, 2011	BLM Interdisciplinary Team	Alternatives	Kathleen Depukat, Emily Garber, Dave Scarborough, Jack Ragsdale, Steve Bird, Andrea Felton
June 25, 2012	ADOT, AGFD, ASLD, City of Maricopa, MAG, City of Goodyear	Cooperating agency kick-off meeting	Kathleen Depukat, Emily Garber, Cheryl Blanchard, Jack Ragsdale, Andrea Felton
October 17, 2012	City of Goodyear, AGFD	Wildlife crossing recommendations	Kathleen Depukat, Steve Bird, Andrea Felton, Dave Scarborough, Joe Schmitz, Harvey Krauss, Christine McMurdy, Dana Warnecke, Michael Ingraldi, Scott Sprague

5.1.1.2 Scoping Report

A detailed description of the scoping process, planning issues derived from the comments, and analysis of the information received is contained in the BLM April 2009 scoping report (BLM 2009b). The scoping report is available at the BLM Lower Sonoran Field Office. The BLM received 17 scoping letters from individuals and businesses; federal, state, and local agencies; and nongovernment organizations. Informal comments captured through the public scoping meeting notes were also included in the scoping report.

5.1.1.3 Additional Project Outreach

As noted above, scoping meetings were held in 2008. Additional data gathering was conducted during 2009 and 2010, and alternatives development was conducted during 2011 and 2012. A brief project newsletter was developed and posted to the BLM website in fall 2012 to update the public on the status of the project. A postcard with the BLM contact information and website link was also mailed to stakeholders in February 2013.

5.1.2 Agency Coordination/Consultation

5.1.2.1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction of their designated critical habitat. It also requires consultation with the USFWS in making that determination.

BLM will initiate Section 7 consultation.

5.1.2.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Section 404 of the CWA regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands and other special aquatic sites. Because this is a linear transportation project, impacts to each wash are anticipated to be treated separately as non-notifying under Nationwide Permit No. 14.

5.1.2.3 Arizona State Historic Preservation Office

BLM consults with the SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA when BLM actions may affect cultural properties. Consultations will be initiated when a complete cultural resources inventory report has been completed.

5.1.3 Cooperating Agency Involvement

During April 2012, BLM initiated Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) invitations to local municipalities and agencies, whose purpose would be to establish a formal SVPP cooperating agency partnership.

The cooperating agencies assisted with Draft EIS preparation in a number of ways, including providing up-to-date and relevant studies and inventories, reviewing public involvement documents, identifying issues, assisting with the formulation of alternatives, and reviewing Administrative Draft EIS text and other Draft EIS materials (as specified in 40 CFR 1501.6[b]). BLM and their subcontractor host monthly informational conference calls with the cooperating agencies. Not all of the cooperating agencies participated in all aspects of the EIS preparation. As lead agency, BLM is responsible for the content of the EIS.

Arizona Department of Transportation

Although the SVPP, if constructed, would not become an ADOT-managed roadway (generally, Parkways are locally constructed, maintained, and managed), the Parkway would likely have a cumulative effect on other existing and future ADOT-managed roadways in the SVPA. Therefore, ADOT's expertise in new road construction and access to conceptual plans and designs of future roadways (namely, the future SR 303L and I-11 Freeway) provided an invaluable resource for the BLM and City during the SVPP NEPA process.

Arizona Game and Fish Department

The AGFD participated in the public scoping process and collaborated with the BLM during pre-NEPA wildlife connectivity analysis. Because the SVPP has the potential to impact wildlife within Rainbow Valley and the SVPA, AGFD is a cooperating agency for this Draft EIS.

Arizona State Land Department

Although the ASLD lands would not be subject to BLM NEPA review, the City would nonetheless be required to have ASLD ROW authorization for any ASLD land that would be needed to construct, operate, and maintain the Parkway. Therefore, because of their special expertise regarding the resources within these lands and the State's interest in maximizing revenue from its Trust lands, ASLD has been designated a cooperating agency.

Maricopa Association of Governments

As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Maricopa County Region, MAG plans and finances the regional transportation system, including the preparation of an RTP, the Transportation Improvement Program, and other traffic data, forecasts, and modeling. Because of their involvement in future transportation planning within the SVPA and region, MAG has been designated a cooperating agency.

Flood Control District of Maricopa County

Waterman Wash, the major drainage of Rainbow Valley, serves as the drainage to the Gila River and would be crossed or paralleled by the SVPP, depending on the alternative implemented if a ROW were granted by BLM. Because of Waterman Wash's relatively natural and undisturbed state, identification as a wildlife corridor by AGFD and the BLM, and the fact that FCDMC has committed a substantial effort to the *Rainbow Valley Area Drainage Master Plan*, FCDMC has been designated as a cooperating agency.

City of Maricopa

The City of Maricopa is located approximately 8 miles east of the community of Mobile on SR 238. The City of Maricopa has been intimately involved with RTP public involvement, county-level planning, and ADOT transportation planning. Currently, the City of Maricopa includes two points of access from the greater Phoenix metropolitan area: one from the northeast and one from the west. The SVPP, if constructed, would provide a vital third access point connection to the greater metropolitan Phoenix area. Therefore, the City of Maricopa has been designated as a cooperating agency.

5.1.4 Tribal Consultation

The BLM Lower Sonoran Field Office initiated tribal consultation in July 2008 by sending out letters to the chairmen of five tribes. These included the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, and the Hopi Tribe. Courtesy copies were sent to each tribal cultural resources staff member under separate cover. The letters indicated that consultation would be initiated under NEPA, NHPA, and AIRFA and that an EIS would be written that would analyze the impacts to natural and cultural resources. New letters were sent out in March 2013, to update the information and provide copies of the cultural survey for review. Follow-up telephone calls were made by the BLM Phoenix District to gather information on any concerns the tribes may have.

5.1.4.1 Specific Tribal Consultation Actions

None are identified at this time; however tribal consultation is ongoing and specific tribal consultation actions would be determined during the Final EIS.

5.1.5 Recipients of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Pursuant to CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.19) the BLM is circulating this Draft EIS to 1) agencies having jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and any appropriate federal, state, or local agency authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, 2) the applicant, and 3) any agencies, organizations, or individuals requesting a copy of the document.

The SVPP EIS distribution list was developed from the stakeholders lists compiled prior to and during the scoping process, which was then supplemented throughout the planning process. Those interested in receiving project updates were able to note their interest on scoping comment forms or to submit their information to Kathleen Depukat via email, telephone, fax, or in writing. A complete list of all recipients of the Draft EIS can be found in the Administrative Record.

Those reviewing the Draft EIS have 45 days in which to provide comments. Comments should be as specific as possible. According to CEQ (40 CFR 1503.4), the BLM must respond in writing to every comment, even if such a response necessitates substantial changes to the EIS. These responses will be published as part of the Final EIS.

5.1.6 List of Preparers

The SVPP EIS was written by a team composed of BLM and third-party contractor personnel. Under direction of the BLM, the consulting team prepared alternatives, collected data for the analysis, assessed potential effects of the alternatives, and prepared other chapters with additional comments and critiques from the cooperating agencies. The BLM has approved the content of this EIS. Table 5-2 identifies the agencies and individuals involved with the preparation and review of this EIS.

Table 5-2. List of Preparers

Entity		Responsibility	Title	Years of Experience
Bureau of Land Management				
Andersen	Jim	Lands Use/Access	Lead Realty Specialist	32
Baker	Leah	NEPA Adequacy	NEPA Coordinator	15
Bickauskas	Tom	Travel Management	Travel Management Coordinator	9
Bird	Steve	Wildlife	Wildlife Biologist	11
Blanchard	Cheryl	Cultural Resources	Archaeologist	5
Depukat	Kathleen	Project Manager	Project Manager	30
Felton	Andrea	Livestock Grazing	Range Conservationist	7
Garber	Emily	Project Management	Field Manager	30
Hanson	Rich	Project Management	SDNM Manager	30
Horyza	Chris	NEPA Adequacy	NEPA Coordinator	33
Hughes	Tim	Wildlife	Wildlife Biologist	26
Johnson	Michael	Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	Zone Social Scientist	26
Lambeth	Bryan	Livestock Grazing	Range Specialist	7

1 **Table 5-2. List of Preparers (Continued)**

Entity		Responsibility	Title	Years of Experience
Bureau of Land Management, cont'd.				
Scarborough	Dave	Wilderness, National Monuments, Special Designations, Visual Resources	Recreation Planner	30
Ragsdale	Jack	Recreation	Recreation Planner	30
Young	Lori	Wildlife		7
SWCA Environmental Consultants				
Bellavia	Cara	Project Manager, Social and Economic Conditions	SWCA Southwest Planning Lead	15
Bell	Shari	Document Formatting	Formatter	5
Cecere	Pamela	Visual Resources, Travel Management, Social and Economic Conditions	Environmental Planner	11
Desruisseaux	Danielle	Technical Editing	Technical Editor	10
Gladding	Eleanor	Vegetation Resources, Wildlife and Special-Status Species	Biologist	15
O'Brien	Steve	Soil Resources, Hazardous Materials / Public Safety	Environmental Specialist	16
Orcutt-Gachiri	Heidi	Technical Editing	Technical Editor	12
Query	Chris	Maps and Figures	GIS/CADD Specialist	14
Rausch	Ryan	Assistant Project Manager, Lands and Realty, Recreation Management, Special Designations	Environmental Planner	8
Rietz	DeAnne	Water Resources	Hydrologist	12
Rigg	Jonathan	Livestock Grazing/Wildland Fire	Planning Specialist	6
Tremblay	Adrienne	Cultural and Heritage Resources, Paleontological Resources	Archaeologist	11
Whitley	Dan	Air Resources, Noise	Environmental Specialist	6

2